

letter, which "mukky" is not, and not the letter, which "Kileth".

Elsewhere in the preface it is pointed out that the four Gospels were none of them composed before the latter half of the first century, and that the names of the four were not known until the beginning of the *third* century. The titles "Matthew," "Mark," "Luke," and "John" are probably only the assumed names under which has been common and allowable their unknown authors or compilers wrote. It is pronounced possible, and even probable, that the first century collection of an original collection of some twelve or thirteen by some one of the disciples or apostles of Jesus. Upon this theory their agreements and disagreements may be accounted for, while at the same time the careful student of the points of likeness and unlikeness may discover the several sources and directions of their materials again into one completed work.

It is also pointed out that the theory is consistently accurate in all that is most permanently important in the life and teachings of Jesus. This is what the author has attempted in that part of the "Ancient Sacred Scriptures" which is devoted to the New Testament. But, in the preface to the New Testament, which his selections have been made, we find that what he says about John's Gospel, and about the mode of translating certain phrases to which a special significance has been attached. It is well known that the compiler of the fourth Gospel is mistaken when he regards the author of the Synoptic Gospels as having relied to his biography of Jesus upon the *three* Gospels. Introduction, commencing with, "In the beginning was the Logos." The Logos, however, as it has since come to be called, is not in any way referred to in any other portion of the New Testament, and from the viewpoint of the author of the Synoptic Gospels, as a subtle borrowed originally from the Jewish schools of philosophy. The author of the fourth Gospel also added frequently to his account of what Jesus said and did philosophical opinions of his own, which not only are not confirmed by the records of the other Gospels, but are not confirmed by the Synoptic Gospels, but are out of harmony with them. He has also added incidents not mentioned by any of the other biographers. Passing now to the phrases "Son of Man" and "Son of God," which occur in the Gospels, and upon which great stress has been laid by theologians, the author of "Ancient Sacred Scriptures" says that the Greek and Hebrew writings—those phrases are frequently found, especially in the later or prophetic periods. They are used interchangeably, and are equivalents, with the common understanding, apparently, that they were both titles which all good men might assume or have applied to themselves. However, the author of the distinguished virtue or wisdom who were called and called themselves by these terms. When, therefore, Jesus appeared, calling himself and being called "son of Man" and "Son of God," it was no novelty; it was in keeping with the common speech of the Hebrews as applied to themselves. However, the author of the Synoptic Gospels, recognizing this to be the fact, the present translator has departed from the custom of writing or printing these appellations

The Apostolic Letters are acknowledged by the author of the book before us, as by almost all other students, to be the oldest of all Christian writings. They are undoubtedly letters which were originally written by absent pastors to the churches, and were designed to be read by the members of those churches for their instruction and edification. Of such letters a great many were written; only the more important of them were preserved by those to whom they were addressed. Most even of those preserved are of the second and third line of general instruction or instruction of the whole church, which now constitutes the Epistles of the New Testament was made up; they were not deemed worthy of preservation. So it has come to pass that the twenty-one letters now found in the New Testament, together with the Four Gospels, are the only remains of the New Testament, have come down to us, the only remains of the fittest out of that mass of early Christian writings to which the writer of the Fourth Gospel might have applied his remark: "I suppose that even the world itself could not have contained the books." Of the twenty-one letters of the Apostles, the New Testament, to name them, that to the Hebrews, that of Peter, the second and third of John, were long repudiated by many as spurious and unworthy of preservation; they are still held by many competent and fair-minded investigators to be, in common with some of the shorter letters, of the second and third century, the productions not of those whose names are attached to them, but of some unknown persons writing under assumed names, a practice which at the time was allowable and common. The author of "Ancient Sacred Scriptures," however, is convinced that all of the New Testament letters, and especially the Letter to the Hebrews and Philomachus in the Second and Third Epistles of John, are valuable, by whomsoever written, from the Letter to the Hebrews, so frequently and persistently denied, proves, in his judgment, when properly translated and apprehended, to be one of the most important and inspiring portions of the Christian Scriptures. The Letters to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thimotheus and Timothy, eleven in all, it may be said that they are particularly valuable, as being the only New Testament writings whose real authorship is of undoubted authenticity, known. That St. Paul wrote or dictated the Letter to the Romans is exceedingly probable, as also the fact that they are the oldest of all Christian Scriptures which have been handed down to us. The Letter to the Romans was undoubtedly written about A. D. 60, and the other letters of St. Paul were written or dictated at various times, the Greek in which these epistles were originally penned, we are invited to observe that nowhere in the whole range of literature, ancient or modern, are sentiments so majestic clothed in words and phrases so inadequate for their complete comprehension. The truth is, that the Greek language, as it was, it was to the other New Testament authors, that when he attempted to write or dictate letters in this strange language the thoughts

We reproduce one more of the questions to which those who insist upon applying modern scholarship to the interpretation of the Bible are expected to reply. Why continue the use of such archaic terms as *the Trinity* and *the Holy Apostles* to designate the subjects of such a large common to the written and extemporaneous devotions of orthodox Christians, the medieval and modern meaning of which is so widely different from the beliefs entertained by the upholders of the terms? Why continue to employ the terms, which imply belief in the divinity of neither Jesus nor any of the spiritual and intelligent Christians of the first two centuries entertained? An answer is suggested by a well-known American physician, who, in a work on pathology, has demonstrated that the use of such terms which have long ceased to possess their original significance. "Nearly all our medical terminology," expresses our ignorance more than our knowledge. Despite all our progress in medical science, we are yet obliged to retain terms which are very inadequate, for even our best books are obliged to explain, and to understand what they mean now and then, there is no serious objection to their use. Indeed, their retention is a matter of necessity until such a time as the fuller nature of the various diseases shall be unveiled; then the terms will be meaningless, and can be and will be gradually abandoned. On similar grounds would the author of "Renascence Christianity" justify his employment of theological terminology. He would not deny that such terms as *the Trinity*, such creeds as the *Nicene*, and such dogmatic or symbolic statements as the *Apostles' Creed* are inadequate as well as devotion express ignorance more than knowledge. "Despite our progress, however, we are yet obliged to retain them, inadequate as they are, to convey our higher meaning. As we seek not revolution but reformation, we retain them until not only our own knowledge, but the knowledge of those whom we address upon the ground and

properly within the province of special works upon New Testament literature, exegesis of theology. For, of course, the apostolic age includes the age of the New Testament, and in the pages of the latter are set forth the thoughts and deeds of the leading actors in the drama of the Church's infancy. It is devoted to an account of the origin of Christianity, after which the author discusses primitive Jewish Christianity which preceded the work performed by Paul. It is the latter topic that constitutes the principal subject of the second and third supplemental chapters. In the fourth, which traces the development of the Church and examines the "Christianity" of the Johannine writings and the radical Paulinism evolved by the Gnostics and other sectaries.

The most characteristic feature of the first chapter is the paragraph in which Paul indicates what he deems the secret of the historical significance of Jesus. After pointing out that Jesus the Christ has been thought of almost from the beginning as the incarnation of the Deity, and as the perfect and sole man, the author submits that, as a matter of fact, it was not until the development upon the perfection of His humanity that His disciples founded the Christian Church. The men whom He gathered about Him regarded Him in neither of these aspects. They thought of Him only as the Messiah, and as He Himself had said, "I am the Christ, the Son of David." He is not the Christ in the sense of a mere name, and that He is the Christ in history as the founder of a religion and not a mere name or prophet, is historically due not so much to any uniqueness, either in character or in His nature, as to the conviction which he succeeded in imparting to His followers that He was the Son of God, as He promised by the prophets and long awaited by the Father. The power of His personality is revealed by His success in impressing that belief upon them, in spite of the difficulties with which it was beset. He might have been, however, a good teacher, and a good and kindly worker, and yet have failed to win the

passive instrument in its hands, and to be moved and played upon by it. He was not endowed with the power to speak in foreign languages; his words were divine, not human, and he spoke to men whatever they were, in the language of the most intelligent human tongue. It is unnatural, therefore, that the speakers should appear to unbelieving auditors to be demented or intoxicated, as Paul implies was not infrequently the case. It is further pointed out, however, in Peter's discourse, which constitutes the chief evidence for the use of the language concerning what actually occurred on the day of Pentecost, is there any reference to the use of foreign languages by his fellow disciples, not even when he undertakes to defend them against the charge of drunkenness. Neither there nor in the New Testament writings do the disciples appear to have been distinguished by their miraculous power to speak in foreign languages, alleged by the author of the Acts to have been conferred upon them on the day of Pentecost.

In the same chapter on primitive Jewish Christianity there is an attempt to explain how the followers of Jesus came to be called Christians in Antioch. Tacitus, if we accept the authenticity of the passages, said that the Romans called them by this name in the time of Nero, and some scholars have consequently held that the Christians of Antioch were Romans. But Lipsius has shown that the word is Greek, not Latin, being formed after the analogy of proper adjectives in -ano-, -iano which were very commonly employed by the Greeks of Asia as party designations. The term might, therefore, designate the Christians of Antioch. As McGiffert, however, does not think it probable that it was first used by the disciples for they called themselves commonly *Alephim* or *Hagim*, nor is it likely that it was used by the Jews, for they could not have acknowledged the disciples of Jesus as followers of the Me-

IV.

Now let us return to the fundamental question, how far do these and other representations of the higher criticism consider that these views impair the credibility of the Bible? shall let them reply, and, so far as this may be practicable, in their own words.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned the theory that the vowel points and accents were original and inspired has been so utterly discredited, that no biblical scholar of the present day would venture to defend it. Lacking this support, however, how can the theory of verbal inspiration stand? Looking at the doctrine of verbal inspiration from the comparatively humble viewpoint merely textual criticism, we must recognize that there can be no inspiration

[illegible]